



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,113	05/31/2001	Harald Michi	10191/1775	9218

26646 7590 12/17/2002

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

LOUIS JACQUES, JACQUES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3661	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/857,113

Applicant(s)

MICHI ET AL.

Examiner

Jacques H. Louis-Jacques

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 15-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 15-17,26 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 18-25 and 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 15-16 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Campbell et al [US 2002/0017415 A1].

Campbell et al discloses a method and apparatus for anticipating a vehicle crash, wherein a future or predicted travel path area of a first vehicle is determined, wherein the first vehicle is equipped with a distance sensor. According to Campbell et al, a relative position of a second vehicle traveling ahead of the second vehicle is determined, wherein the relative position is determined at predetermined points. Furthermore, the course path of the second vehicle is determined based on the determined relative position. According still to Campbell et al, the relative position is stored in a storage device. In addition, a path of the first vehicle is determined based on the course path of the second vehicle and the course of the second vehicle traveling ahead of in direction of a position of the first vehicle can be projected. See columns 1 and 2 of page 2 and column 1 of page 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3661

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 17 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Campbell et al in view of Nishimura et al [5,754,099].

Campbell et al does not particularly disclose the transverse offset and the curvature between course paths. Nishimura et al, on the other hand, discloses an obstacle warning system for a vehicle including a distance indicator (sensor) for determining a relative position between the vehicle and an object (second vehicle). According to Nishimura et al, an object (vehicle) ahead of the vehicle is detected and a path of the object is determined. Furthermore, a transverse position of the object relative to the vehicle is determined and a curvature between the object (moving object) path and the vehicle path is established. See figures 5-6, 13-13-14, 22-23, 27, 29-30, and 33-45. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to modify the system of Campbell et al by incorporating the features from the obstacle warning of Nishimura et al because such modification will eliminate any possibility of collision between the subject vehicle and the object, thereby improving safety.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 18-25 and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Amendment& Arguments

6. The amendments along with the arguments filed on October 28, 2002 have been entered and carefully considered by the examiner.

In regard to the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS), Applicant stated, "Applicants attach hereto a copy of the stamped postcard receipt and also a courtesy copy of the PTO Form 1449 that accompanied this IDS". However, no such "postcard" or "courtesy copy of the PTO Form 1449" has been received. Applicant is respectfully suggested to resubmit these documents in order for the examiner to consider the IDS.

In regard to the rejections, Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In light of the above, this office action is made non-final.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5,786,787

Ericksson et al

Jul. 1998

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques H. Louis-Jacques whose telephone number is (703) 305-9757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM (Eastern Time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William A. Cuchlinski can be reached on (703) 308-3873. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 3661

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1111.

Jacques H. Louis-Jacques
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3661

/jlj
December 12, 2002

Jacques H. Louis-Jacques
JACQUES H. LOUIS-JACQUES
PRIMARY EXAMINER